UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/764,536 01/27/2004		Koji Ohashi	325772033800	325772033800 8912	
Barry E. Bretso	7590 04/10/2007		EXAM	INER	
Morrison & Foerster LLP			LE, HUNG	LE, HUNG CHARLIE	
Suite 300 1650 Tysons B	oulevard	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
McLean, VA 22102			3663		
				<u> </u>	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS		04/10/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/764,536	OHASHI ET AL.			
Office Action Summary		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Hung C. Le	3663			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SH WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any (ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 De	ecember 2006.	•			
′=	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
3)[_	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.			
Dispositi	on of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1 - 3, 8 - 9 is/are pending in the applic 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1 - 3, 8 - 9 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.				
Applicati	on Papers		•			
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the o Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example.	epted or b) objected to by the formula of the following on be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing (s) is object.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). sected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachmen —						
2) 🔲 Notic 3) 🔯 Inforr	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate			

Application/Control Number: 10/764,536

Art Unit: 3663

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 3, 8 – 9 (claim 4 was cancelled by applicant, claims 5 – 7 were withdrawn by applicant, claims 8 – 9 were added by applicant) have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- Claims 1 3, 8 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knaup (7,082,808) in view of Yasushi (JP 2002-316226). Knaup discloses applicant's claim limitations as below.

With respect to claim 1:

Knaup discloses: A drawing method for forming a reflective curved surface of a

Art Unit: 3663

converging mirror, comprising pressing a metal plate (17) fitted in a fixed die (4) with a movable die (10), so as to have a compressed border portion between a non-pressed portion and the reflective curved surface pressed portion (see Fig. 4), the border portion being compressed to have a thickness which is at least certain % of a thickness of the metal plate (17) before drawing, and drawing the compressed metal plate (17) to form the reflective curved surface (see Col. 3, lines 55 – 60).

While patent drawings are not drawn to scale, relationships clearly shown in the drawings of a reference patent cannot be disregarded in determining the patentability of claims. See <u>In re Mraz</u>, 59 CCPA 866, 455 F.2d 1069, 173 USPQ 25 (1972).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to vary the percentage of the thickness (See Knaup: Col. 3, lines 55 – 60) within the range (70 – 90 %) suggested by applicant to achieve a desired result. It is well-settled that optimizing a result effective variable is well within the expected ability of a person of ordinary skill in the subject art. In re

Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980), In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA 1955).

Knaup does not set forth the use of his process to mirrors. However, Yasushi

Art Unit: 3663

(Abstract, Fig.) teaches about applying the method for a converging mirror.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the method as disclosed by Knaup by the teaching of Yasushi to form a pressed optical element/converging mirror in order to utilize a pressed plate for universal usage and as such modification is no more than the use of a well known expedient within the art.

With respect to claim 2:

Knaup further discloses: wherein the reflective curve surface is a free curve surface (see Figs. 4).

With respect to claims 3 & 8:

Knaup further discloses: wherein the metal plate (17) is an aluminum alloy plate (Col. 4, lines 39+).

With respect to claim 9:

Knaup further discloses: wherein the border portion of the metal plate (17) is compressed to have a thickness which is within a range of certain % of a thickness of the metal plate (17) before drawing (see Fig. 4; Col. 3, lines 55 - 60).

Conclusion

Page 5

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hung C. Le whose telephone number is 571-272-8757. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 07:30am - 05:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack W. Keith can be reached on 571-272-6878. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application/Control Number: 10/764,536

Art Unit: 3663

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HCL 03/30/07

JACK KEITH SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER